REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-24 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-17 are canceled and claim 18 has been amended. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Boydstun et al. U. S. Patent 6,839,708 (herein Boydstun) and further in view of Pallante U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0028495 (herein Pallante). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-17 have been cancelled. Claim 18 has been amended to further clarify the distinction of the invention over the cited art. In the final office action, the Examiner stated that "[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine attaching a digital certificate to a service request, as taught by Pallante, with the programmable apparatus/web service architecture/computer readable memory/method of Boydstun and that "[i]t would have been obvious for such modifications because a digital certificate provides assurance that the person requesting service is indeed who they say they are."

Applicants submit that the claimed invention contains a number of elements that cooperate together to perform an authentication using a digital certificate in a way that cannot be performed by Boydstun al and Pallante, individually or in combination. Boydstun and Pallante cannot perform the claimed authentication because they do not authenticate the digital certificate after interception, extract a service client identifier from the digital certificate, and store the extracted service client identifier in a memory so that the web service manager can retrieve the client identifier and determine whether the client is entitled to receive the services. In other words, Applicants' invention does more than just authenticate the request to get through the firewall -- rather it extracts the client identifier from the digital certificate so that the information can be used to access other information about the client to determine whether the client is "entitled" to receive the service. For example, if the client has paid for the service, then the client would be entitled to the service. Then the request is forwarded to the web service manager for processing. The combination of elements that cooperate together as claimed are not present in the cited references, either individually or in combination.

Support for amended claim 18 is found in the specification as shown in the table below:

A method of authenticating and authorizing a service request sent from a service client from a service client through a firewall to a service provider, comprising the steps of:	FIG. 3, firewall 300, service client 310
using a service request filter, intercepting an incoming service request from a service client on a communication channel, the service request having a digital certificate of the service client attached;	[0011], line 3-4; [0033], line 9
using the service request filter, authenticating the digital certificate with an issuing certification authority;	[0033], line 10
using the service request filter, extracting a service client identifier from the digital certificate associated with the service request;	[0033], line 13
using the service request filter, storing the service client identifier in a memory;	[0033], line 15
using the service request filter, forwarding the service request to a web service manager;	[0033], line 21
at the web service manager, responsive to receiving the service request, retrieving the service client identifier from the memory and sending an authentication request to a service client authentication program;	FIG. 3, [0033], lines 23-23
responsive to receiving an authentication request from a web service manager at the service client authentication program, matching the service client identifier with a service client record;	FIG. 3, [0033], line 26
responsive to matching the service client identifier with the service client record, sending a request to a service authorization program for an authorization for the service request;	FIG. 3, [0033], line 28
at the service authorization program, determining if the service client identifier associated with the service request is entitled to access the service provider; and	FIG. 3, [0033], line 29-31
responsive to determining that the service client is entitled, returning a service authorization to the web service manager;	FIG. 3, [0033], line 31-32
at the web service manager, routing the service request to the service provider to process the request;	FIG. 3, [0033], line 33

responsive to the service provider processing the request, returning an output to the web service manager.	FIG. 3; [0033], lines 34-35

Therefore, Applicants submit that Boydstun and Pallante, individually or in combination, are silent as to extracting a service client identifier and then storing the service client identifier in a memory so that the service client identifier can be matched with a service client record to determine if the service client is entitled to the service. If the Examiner maintains that Boydstun et. al, col. 8, lines 17-36 and/or Pallante disclose these limitations, then Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner set forth in detail how extraction from a digital certificate of a service client identifier is performed and disclosed.

Applicants submit that the Examiner cannot set forth in detail how extraction from a digital certificate is performed by a combination of Boydstun and Pallante because the Examiner has not matched specific disclosures in the cited to specific limitations in the claims. Rather the Examiner has distilled the invention down to a "gist" or "thrust" and disregards the requirement of analyzing the subject matter of the claim "as a whole." *W.L Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F. 2d 1540, (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 851 (1984). Moreover, the extraction is not inherent in the disclosures because "[t]he face that a certain result or characteristic may occur or be present in the prior art is not sufficient to establish the inherency of that result or characteristic. *In re Rijckaert*, 9 F.3d 1531, 1534 (Fed. Cir. 1993). "To establish inherency, the extrinsic evidence 'must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thin described in the reference, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill. Inherency, however, may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a set of circumstances is not sufficient." *In re Robertson*, 169 F. 3d 743, 745 (Fed. Cir.1999).

While Applicants have discussed extraction as a specific example of the deficiency of the cited art, the same arguments apply to the whole claim's cooperation of the elements in order to get a service request processed in the manner set forth in claim 18. For example, the references do not disclose a service request filter as claimed, a web service manager as claimed, or a service client authentication program as claimed.

Therefore, the rejection of claims 18-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been overcome.

II. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over Boydstun and Pallante and is now in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: October 16, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Rudolf O. Siegesmund/

Rudolf O. Siegesmund
Reg. No. 37,720
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Attorney for Applicants